

20020907.ba v03_n389.bam.20020907

>From ???@??? Sat Sep 7 20:18:44 2002 -0500
Message-Id: <200209080118.g881IQhj000704@sco.theporch.com>
Date: Sat, 7 Sep 2002 20:17:35 CDT
From: Old Tube Radios <boatanchors@theporch.com>
To: Old Tube Radios <boatanchors@theporch.com>
Subject: BOATANCHORS digest 3389

BOATANCHORS Digest 3389

Topics covered in this issue include:

- 1) Old Subs == Old Radios
by Josh Rovero <provero@myeastern.com>
- 2) RE: BRA Info sought
by "Edward Zeranski" <ezeran@concentric.net>
- 3) RE: Philo Farnsworth
by "Edward Zeranski" <ezeran@concentric.net>
- 4) Re: BRA Info sought
by Mike Sullivan <vze344qr@verizon.net>
- 5) Re: Philo Farnsworth
by Henry van Cleef <vancleef@eskimo.com>
- 6) RCA, etc
by W0E0M@aol.com
- 7) RPT magazines
by "Jack Antonio" <scr-287@sbcglobal.net>
- 8) Dentron 160-10L Amp Manual needed
by Robert Kemp <rkemp@mr.net>
- 9) Re: Japanese radio
by "Don Davis" <dxguy@earthlink.net>
- 10) (Fwd) Emioassion Tube Testers
by "Dennis L. Wade" <dlwade@pacbell.net>
- 11) FS Collins Phone Patch
by "Jack Antonio" <scr-287@sbcglobal.net>
- 12) SBE-34 info wanted
by "Jack Antonio" <scr-287@sbcglobal.net>
- 13) Re: (Fwd) Emioassion Tube Testers
by W7QH0@aol.com
- 14) Re: SBE-34 info wanted
by "James C. Garland" <4cx250b@muohio.edu>
- 15) Re: [Test-Equipment] Emioassion Tube Testers
by Avery Comarow <acomarow@usnews.com>
- 16) RE: Sperti
by "Robert W. Downs" <RWDowns_WA5CAB@compuserve.com>
- 17) RE: Need BC-348 Dual Pot
by "Robert W. Downs" <RWDowns_WA5CAB@compuserve.com>
- 18) Re: GC Decorative Nut Wrench

by WA1KBQ@aol.com

Message-ID: <3D7928F0.1020202@myeastern.com>
Date: Fri, 06 Sep 2002 18:15:12 -0400
From: Josh Rovero <provero@myeastern.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: Old Tube Radios <boatanchors@theporch.com>
Subject: Old Subs == Old Radios
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Slightly OT, but good possibility of BA content
even if that isn't the primary purpose.

On September 21, 2002, 8PM EDT, The History Channel
will air "100 Years of Silent Service". Hosted by
President Carter, it is the story of the 100 year
history of U.S. submarines, told by the men who
served aboard them.

Where there are old submarines, there are old
submarine radios.

Produced where I work, but not by me. I stick to
oceanography and meteorology.

From: "Edward Zeranski" <ezeran@concentric.net>
To: Old Tube Radios <boatanchors@theporch.com>
Subject: RE: BRA Info sought
Date: Fri, 6 Sep 2002 16:28:16 -0700
Message-ID: <FHEBKNEBHGNPDPLBMCNEAEMBCGAA.ezeran@concentric.net>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Hollowstaters,

I picked up a very good condition RBA-8

1) What are the differences between a RBA-7 and a RBA-8?
73 Russ W2DYY

Russ,

Not sure on the difference between the models though I have an RBA-RBB/RBC
family at home with the manuals and some junkers. Will look it up for you

when I get home next week. RBA has it's own manual while the RBB/RBC are in the same. Neat bench ballast when played against the RAK/RAL ! I have them all as a gravity exhibit in my garage.

From: "Edward Zeranski" <ezeran@concentric.net>
To: Old Tube Radios <boatanchors@theporch.com>
Subject: RE: Philo Farnsworth
Date: Fri, 6 Sep 2002 16:28:18 -0700
Message-ID: <FHEBKNEBHGNPDPLBMCNECEMBCGAA.ezeran@concentric.net>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
 charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Sarnoff used RCA's money to hose Farnsworth.

To: Old Tube Radios
Subject: Philo Farnsworth

..... his development of the TV camera tube and how he has been overlooked because of
Sarnoff

Jack McDermott KB1IJP

Message-ID: <3D794955.C04FA1D5@verizon.net>
Date: Fri, 06 Sep 2002 20:33:24 -0400
From: Mike Sullivan <vze344qr@verizon.net>
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: Old Tube Radios <boatanchors@theporch.com>
CC: Old Tube Radios <boatanchors@theporch.com>
Subject: Re: BRA Info sought
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

I got an RBC last weekend at Shelby hamfest. Neat old bird. I need a 600 ohm - 4 ohm transformer to get real audio from the beast. A few problems but it reminds me of the old RBC I got for \$8 in 1972 that worked great. Got it at an old salvage yard near Burlington NC while I was at Duke. Have kicked myself repeatedly since selling it. Now I have one again. Love it already even though it has a few circuit problems.
Mike
kc2kj

Edward Zeranski wrote:

>
> Hollowstaters,
>
> I picked up a very good condition RBA-8

>
> 1) What are the differences between a RBA-7 and a RBA-8?
> 73 Russ W2DYY
>
> Russ,
> Not sure on the difference between the models though I have an RBA-RBB/
RBC
> family at home with the manuals and some junkers. Will look it up for you
> when I get home next week. RBA has it's own manual while the RBB/RBC are in
> the same. Neat bench ballast when played against the RAK/RAL ! I have them
> all as a gravity exhibit in my garage.

From: Henry van Cleef <vancleef@eskimo.com>
Message-Id: <200209070035.RAA26187@eskimo.com>
Subject: Re: Philo Farnsworth
To: Old Tube Radios <boatanchors@theporch.com>
Date: Fri, 6 Sep 2002 18:35:33 -0600 (MDT)
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

The esteemed Jderm740@aol.com has said:

>
> There is an article from the associated press circulating, detailing his
> development of the TV camera tube and how he has been overlooked because of
> Sarnoff and RCA. If It's in your paper read it. It's an eye opener.
>

Hoo boy! Big bad Sarnoff again. Whenever I hear about some fine new history presentation that rehabilitates some early electronics worker who took a bath at the behest of big bad Sarnoff, I hold onto my credibility detectors.

I don't think any knowledgeable student of the history of technology, even before that was a formal field of study (Mel Kranzberg, 1948---I was one of Kranzberg's last students) ignored the contributions of Farnsworth or Major Armstrong or Allen Dumont to electronics.

>From my perspective, Farnsworth is noteworthy for his image dissector camera tube. He had the thing working in 1927, applied for a very comprehensive patent on it, and rights to use technology covered by that patent were needed to put an all-electronic television in the market. Farnsworth's image dissector worked---but it did not have

adequate output under realistic lighting conditions, and had fairly high noise content in its output. It has to be regarded as the basis for a successful electronic television camera, but required considerable refinement before it was really usable for television broadcast.

One worker whose name is often mentioned---then whose work is quickly dismissed---is John Logie Baird. Baird's early televisions were all based on mechanical scanners---the Nipkow disk (1884). But, as his son points out when talking about him, if we give credit to Marconi for developing a practical wireless radio, and ignore the simple facts that Marconi used a spark-gap transmitter and a coherer detector, then we have to give credit to Baird's mechanical system, because Marconi's technology was just as primitive---and out of the mainstream of what ultimately became commercially successful, as Baird's original technology. What is also ignored is that Baird evolved his system---he began using CRT technology for the receiver as early as 1932, had developed a successful 3-color CRT in 1944-5, and that there is some evidence that he did secret work for the British government on pulsed RF signal reflection and timing that predates Watson-Watt's 1935 "radar." Baird's early death, at age 58 in 1946, probably prevented him from gaining any real place in the sun in commercial television history, since a practical home television, while introduced in Britain in 1936 (parallel systems: Baird at 240 lines, EMI at 405, which came to predominate) did not become a popular reality until 1947-48.

My own knowledge of television technology really began when I acquired a copy of Zworykin and Morton's "Television" (Wiley, 1940). My copy was printed in January 1945, which suggests that I read it sometime in the year following, and marvel, after reviewing it recently, that I got anything out of it at age 10-11. The book does have an index reference to a two-page discussion of Farnsworth's image detector, and a bibliographical reference to a major 1934 paper by Farnsworth. While one may accuse Zworykin (who was Sarnoff's "TV guy") of not touting up Farnsworth's work, he does acknowledge Farnsworth's contributions at a level that parallels his acknowledgements of many other's work in the field---there isn't any real theme in that book that Zworykin and RCA "invented" television to the exclusion of everybody else. Unfortunately, Baird gets short shrift in this book---only the Nipkow disk gets a mention.

I'm not going to suggest that everyone go out and get a copy of this book (which is today, a rare book) and examine it. It's full of discussions about difficulties working with 1930's electronic technology, written at a level that presumes a college graduate level understanding of electrical engineering and physics, and while the mathematics used aren't mind boggling as well, it's a tough read.

Considering that 1940 predates establishment of any of the modern TV standards (NTSC, PAL, SECAM), semiconductor technology, and a bunch of other things----there are easier ways to learn how your TV works. But as an historical work, it does put the lie to any notion that Farnsworth's work was buried in an RCA myth in 1940.

In modern pop history, there seems to be a lot of ballyhoo about the evil hand of Sarnoff and RCA in the early postwar establishment of radio frequency allocations for FM and Television. And everybody seems to overlook that the RS-170 NTSC American television standard, that was established in Nov. 1941, pulled a real switcheroo on friend Sarnoff when it specified FM rather than AM audio for television. The prewar allocations of (as I recall) 42-48 Mhz for FM, and 48-72 Mhz for television (4 channels) were at the top end of the frequency spectrum that commercial home-entertainment manufacturing technology could handle easily. Keep in mind that in 1940, anything below 10-meter wavelength (above 30 Mhz) was called "Ultra High Frequency." By the end of WWII, technology capable of handling 2 meters (145 Mhz) with ease was available to the home-entertainment manufacturers---the addition of a set of high-band (7-13) TV channels (174-216 Mhz) was in the realm of practicality in 1946. And with commercial FM, allocating 20 Mhz. instead of 6 provided some reasonable spectrum for allocating stations at 0.2 Mhz. spacing---TV gets 6 Mhz windows. There was a great deal of competition for allocations in the 6 meter band, and ultimately television channel 1 was removed (1948). Also to be remembered was that TV channel allocation was frozen from 1948-52 as it was obvious that the laws of RF propagation physics at the higher frequencies weren't adequately understood to allow non-interfering assignment of frequencies in the spectrum at appropriate distances. In the long run, physics, and not the heavy hand of Sarnoff and RCA, were a big part of the postwar reallocations. No doubt Sarnoff gloated that all of the prewar FM receivers were obsoleted after 1948 (deallocation date for low band FM), there were several frequency convertors built and sold (I recall a Pilot design) to allow these sets to receive the new FM band, and these could be and were brought to market at a reasonable cost.

I think that in looking on the history of the Radio Corporation of America, one has to consider just what that corporation was. It began as a buyout of the American Marconi interests in 1916, something that was promoted and desired by the Wilson administration, to domesticate control of radio patents. Until 1928, RCA operated strictly as a patent pool, held by GE, Westinghouse, and (until 1926) Western Electric. Equipment marketed under the name "RCA" in the twenties was actually built by GE and Westinghouse factories---RCA had no facilities of its own. Ultimately, in 1928, RCA bought the Victor Talking Machine Co. in toto, which included Victor's manufacturing facilities as well as a whole slew of patents and technology for

electronic recording and playback of phonograph disks. That put RCA in the manufacturing business, but it continued to operate as a patent pool.

There are a lot of parallels between the public's and US government's views of Sarnoff and RCA in the 1930's and current views of Bill Gates and Micro\$oft---that they had become predatory and monopolistic. However, unlike Microsoft, RCA started it's life with government sanction as a holding pool for patents, and continued to operate in that sense well into the 1960's, when most of the key patents had expired. Additionally, World War II and radar development put an end to the notion that "electronics" and "home entertainment" were synonymous. We can, of course, explore the steady flow of government funds and contracts for electronic theoretical and technological development into universities and corporations during the Cold War era, and also examine the decline and fall of the US home entertainment industry (which has completely vanished from the US), and I'm sure that going any further with this is going to be "whew---hold the phone a minute"---except that they are there, and any examination of RCA has to reckon with a few factors other than the personality of big bad Sarnoff. Which is not to attempt to paint Sarnoff as any Mr. Nice Guy---he wasn't, and comes across as something of an egotistical blowhard and perhaps "the last of the Robber Barons," although even Jay Gould doesn't come across as 100% weasel either (maybe Charles Tyson Yerkes does).

And in looking at Philo Farnsworth, we have to look at Farnsworth the man, not just Farnsworth the inventor and his inventions. There seems to be some evidence that he was affected, through much of his adult life, by alcohol and depression, and not always able to function very well. There seem to be a couple of recent biographies of him---one by his widow, and one by Schatkin---which I have not read. And whether either of them goes into great detail about Farnsworth the man, I can't say----but before evaluating him completely, I'd want to know more about this aspect of things.

Hank

--

Hank van Cleef (vancleef@eskimo.com, hvanclee@nyx.net)

From: W0E0M@aol.com

Message-ID: <10f.16b7a638.2aaabe78@aol.com>
Date: Fri, 6 Sep 2002 22:29:12 EDT
Subject: RCA, etc
To: Old Tube Radios <boatanchors@theporch.com>
CC: boatanchors@theporch.com
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;
boundary="part1_10f.16b7a638.2aaabe78_boundary"

--part1_10f.16b7a638.2aaabe78_boundary
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Hank - well done! another note, a Farnworth Image Dissector tube is on display at FRY'S electronic store in sunnyvale, CA, the Perham foundation has six displays there, including an Apple 1.

I did the one showing a deForest spherical Audion with RJ-9 control panel.

Will Jensby

--part1_10f.16b7a638.2aaabe78_boundary
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

```
* * * * *
*      ---REMAINDER OF MESSAGE TRUNCATED---      *
*      This post contains a forbidden message format      *
* (such as an attached file, a v-card, HTML formatting) *
*      Mail Lists at theporch.com only accept PLAIN TEXT      *
* If your postings display this message your mail program *
* is not set to send PLAIN TEXT ONLY and needs adjusting *
* * * * *
```

--part1_10f.16b7a638.2aaabe78_boundary--

Message-ID: <001101c256ae\$6f23a360\$6501a8c0@scr274n>
From: "Jack Antonio" <scr-287@sbcglobal.net>
To: Old Tube Radios <boatanchors@theporch.com>
Subject: RPT magazines
Date: Sat, 7 Sep 2002 13:37:49 -0700
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

For those who remember when Motorola HT-200s were *cool*.....

I have a stack of 13 RPT magazines from late 71 thru mid 72 era for postage . These are the later large format (8.5 x 11 size) not the earlier pamphlet style.

Very interesting to look at the Spectronics ads.....

Jack Antonio WA7DIA
scr-287@sbcglobal.net

Message-ID: <3D7A6678.1070904@mr.net>
Date: Sat, 07 Sep 2002 15:50:00 -0500
From: Robert Kemp <rkemp@mr.net>
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: Old Tube Radios <boatanchors@theporch.com>
Subject: Dentron 160-10L Amp Manual needed
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Would anyone have a copy of the 160-10L Dentron Amp?
I'm in need of it AND maybe the intial parameters so I can use it.
I've got her tuned up now and it shows about 500 mils at the dip, which should be pretty much idling....what's proper for this amp?

Bob.

Message-ID: <00d901c256b3\$f949e720\$b912f4d8@hppav>
From: "Don Davis" <dxguy@earthlink.net>
To: Old Tube Radios <boatanchors@theporch.com>
Subject: Re: Japanese radio
Date: Sat, 7 Sep 2002 14:17:28 -0700
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Fair price depends on who you sell it to. For average BA collector / user, not terribly much. But for an avid WWII collector quite a bit more. Ebay brings the best price, and has more transactions than others. Have seen similar radios there in past and they bring big bucks depending on condition, date of mfg, and provenance.

Don AD6PB

----- Original Message -----

From: "philip" <dgnova@erols.com>
To: "Old Tube Radios" <boatanchors@theporch.com>
Sent: Friday, September 06, 2002 11:37 AM
Subject: Japanese radio

> I am trying to determine a fair price for the following set:
>
> One of the local people is trying to sell a Japanese military radio a
> model 94 type 6 transceiver No 23 model H
> This uses a single tube, a type US30mc, and covers about 28mcs to 40mcs
> Size is 3.25 by 5+ by 7+ inches.
>
> What would be a fair price ?
> Philip McCoy dgnova@erols.com
>
>

Date: Sat, 07 Sep 2002 14:23:59 -0700
From: "Dennis L. Wade" <dlwade@pacbell.net>
Subject: (Fwd) Emiossion Tube Testers
To: Old Tube Radios <boatanchors@theporch.com>
Message-id: <3D7A0BFF.27057.49526@localhost>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT
Content-description: Mail message body

Resend due to prior failure

----- Forwarded message follows -----

From: Dennis L. Wade <dlwade@pacbell.net>
To: old Tube Radios <boatanchors@theporch.com>, test
Equip Reflector <test-equipment@mailman.qth.net>
Subject: Emiossion Tube Testers
Date sent: Sat, 7 Sep 2002 11:14:15 -0700

Gentlemen,

I have a small dilemma that I'd like your opinions on.

I've used a Simpson model 305 tube tester for a number of years now
and it seems to work as well as an emission tester should. It is in

good shape and I have a copy of the roll chart.

Recently a Knight Kit KG-600B emission tube tester followed me home from an estate sale. What caught my eye (besides the price) was that it is in nearly pristine condition looking as though it was just assembled yesterday. (The owners notes indicate it was completed in May of 1964). Very clean, good construction practice inside. Seems to work just fine.

Which should I keep? I don't really need two. Are all emission testers basically created equal? My emotional choice would be to keep the Simpson (goes well with my 268 VOM)..but..what do you think?

Thanks!

Dennis

----- End of forwarded message -----
"If you can remain calm, you just don't have all the facts"

Dennis Wade
KG6ZI
Carmichael, CA

Message-ID: <000d01c256b6\$ee9e8d00\$6501a8c0@scr274n>
From: "Jack Antonio" <scr-287@sbcglobal.net>
To: Old Tube Radios <boatanchors@theporch.com>
Subject: FS Collins Phone Patch
Date: Sat, 7 Sep 2002 14:38:36 -0700
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Hi all

I have a Collins 152J-1 Phone Patch for sale.

This is a manual patch for a crystal controlled SSB station of the late 50s era, I had the manual at one time, but can't locate it now, so I can't give you the designation of the whole system.

It is complete, and undamaged, but dusty. And absolutely untested, so I can't guarantee its operation.

I'd like \$30.00 for it, shipping included to USA.

I will also consider a trade for some interesting piece of WWII aircraft radio rear. (Real AN/ARC-5 pieces are top on my list).

Thanks

Jack Antonio WA7DIA
scr-287@sbcglobal.net

Message-ID: <000901c256b9\$fd18e1c0\$6501a8c0@scr274n>
From: "Jack Antonio" <scr-287@sbcglobal.net>
To: Old Tube Radios <boatanchors@theporch.com>
Subject: SBE-34 info wanted
Date: Sat, 7 Sep 2002 15:00:32 -0700
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
 charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Hi all

I recently picked up an SBE-34 which is going to need work.

I have the manual, so restoring basic operation should not be a problem, but a long time ago, I remember hearing that the basic SBE-34 had a couple of problems, and that there some modifications that addressed those problems.

First problem was the receive frequency would change after a transmission. That is to say, when you let go of the PTT, the receiver would be off by a couple of hundred cycles.

Second problem was that the power supply transistors tended to fail a lot. This may have been due to the fact that the DC supply switching transisistors were used as rectifiers on AC operation, but not sure.

I'd also be interested in any other hints, tricks or lore about the radio.

TIA

Jack Antonio WA7DIA
scr-287@sbcglobal.net

From: W7QH0@aol.com
Message-ID: <165.13011c6e.2aabd24e@aol.com>
Date: Sat, 7 Sep 2002 18:06:06 EDT
Subject: Re: (Fwd) EmioSSION Tube Testers
To: Old Tube Radios <boatanchors@theporch.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;
boundary="part1_165.13011c6e.2aabd24e_boundary"

--part1_165.13011c6e.2aabd24e_boundary
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="ISO-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

In a message dated 9/7/02 2:24:22 PM, dlwade@pacbell.net writes (In part):

> Which should I keep?=>A0 I don't really need two....
>=20
Gee whiz, keep both. Do any of us really NEED this stuff? (Sure is fun to pla=
y=20
with, though.)

Dennis D. W7QH0
Glendale, CA

--part1_165.13011c6e.2aabd24e_boundary
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

* * * * *
* ---REMAINDER OF MESSAGE TRUNCATED--- *
* This post contains a forbidden message format *
* (such as an attached file, a v-card, HTML formatting) *
* Mail Lists at theporch.com only accept PLAIN TEXT *
* If your postings display this message your mail program *
* is not set to send PLAIN TEXT ONLY and needs adjusting *
* * * * *

--part1_165.13011c6e.2aabd24e_boundary--

Message-Id: <5.1.0.14.2.20020907190039.00b5a538@admin.muohio.edu>

Date: Sat, 07 Sep 2002 19:05:30 -0400
To: Old Tube Radios <boatanchors@theporch.com>
From: "James C. Garland" <4cx250b@muohio.edu>
Subject: Re: SBE-34 info wanted
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

At 06:00 PM 9/7/2002, you wrote:

>First problem was the receive frequency would change after
>a transmission. That is to say, when you let go of the PTT, the
>receiver would be off by a couple of hundred cycles....
>
>Second problem was that the power supply transistors tended
>to fail a lot. ...
>I'd also be interested in any other hints, tricks or lore
>about the radio.
>
>TIA
>
>Jack Antonio WA7DIA

Hi Jack,

I had an SBE-34 back in the mid sixties and remember the receiver drift problem. There was a factory mod kit for fixing it, which I installed. I vaguely recall it entailed replacing a Ge transistor with a Si transistor, and swapping a few bias resistors and NPO capacitors. The mod took about 2 hours to complete.

I have an SBE-34 now, which doesn't have the problem. Maybe it's a later s/n.

Never had any problem with either rig, blowing the power supply transistors. Actually, I like the SBE-33 better than the SBE-34, though there's a peculiarity with the SBE-33 that requires one to plug the AC cord in with one orientation in the AC socket.

73,
Jim Garland W8ZR

Message-Id: <3.0.6.32.20020907192324.0080eb80@ntpop.usnews.com>
Date: Sat, 07 Sep 2002 19:23:24 -0400
To: Old Tube Radios <boatanchors@theporch.com>
From: Avery Comarow <acomarow@usnews.com>
Subject: Re: [Test-Equipment] Emission Tube Testers
Cc: boatanchors@theporch.com

Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"

Dennis,

The Knightkit 600B is nothing to write home about and certainly not superior to your Simpson, IMO. It's also cheaply made (as I know from painful experience). Even if it works fine, I can't see how you're adding anything by acquiring it.

73, Avery W3AVE in Potomac, Md.

At 11:14 AM 9/7/02 -0700, you wrote:

>Gentlemen,

>

> I have a small dilemma that I'd like your opinions on.

>

> I've used a Simpson model 305 tube tester for a number of years now
>and it seems to work as well as an emission tester should. It is in
>good shape and I have a copy of the roll chart.

>

> Recently a Knight Kit KG-600B emission tube tester followed me home
>from an estate sale. What caught my eye (besides the price) was that
>it is in nearly pristine condition looking as though it was just
>assembled yesterday. (The owners notes indicate it was completed in
>May of 1964). Very clean, good construction practice inside. Seems
>to work just fine.

>

> Which should I keep? I don't really need two. Are all emission
>testers basically created equal? My emotional choice would be to
>keep the Simpson (goes well with my 268 VOM)..but..what do you think?

>

> Thanks!

>

> Dennis-----

>"If you can remain calm, you just don't have all the facts"

>

>Dennis Wade

>KG6ZI

>Carmichael, CA

>

>

>-----
>Test-Equipment mailing list

>Test-Equipment@mailman.qth.net

><http://mailman.qth.net/mailman/listinfo/test-equipment>

>

Date: Sat, 7 Sep 2002 19:38:33 -0400
From: "Robert W. Downs" <RWDowns_WA5CAB@compuserve.com>
Subject: RE: Sperti
To: Old Tube Radios <boatanchors@theporch.com>
Message-ID: <200209071938_MC3-1-EE0-4089@compuserve.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset=ISO-8859-1
Content-Disposition: inline

Group,

Sperti did build the vacuum antenna switches for the ATC and T-47/ART-13.=
=

I have several boxes full of them here, along with the more common ones
made by GE. =

They also built the completely different (for no good reason that I can
see) vacuum switch for the antenna relay in the CU-32/ART-13. I had some=
of those as well, but all that I have left are the complete antenna relay=
assemblies, and I don't know who actually made the vacuum switches in the=
m.

73
Robert Downs
<WA5CAB@cs.com>
Houston

Date: Sat, 7 Sep 2002 19:38:35 -0400
From: "Robert W. Downs" <RWDowns_WA5CAB@compuserve.com>
Subject: RE: Need BC-348 Dual Pot
To: Old Tube Radios <boatanchors@theporch.com>
Message-ID: <200209071938_MC3-1-EE0-408A@compuserve.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset=ISO-8859-1
Content-Disposition: inline

Group,

I thought that most everyone here knew that I had a bunch of mostly

internal BC-348 parts (but no dyanamotors). The gain pot had several different Signal Corps Stock Numbers, depending on which manual you find = it in (and whether for BC-224 or BC-348 as well) but what I have are marked 227284-8 and judging from the packaging were probably made post war. Pri= ce is \$5.00 plus shipping.

I also have Audio Pack Assemblies (audio output transformers) for everything except the JNQ series (they were odd man out in this regard as= well). The output transformers were another item commonly removed in a l= ot of the old "conversions". For the benefit of anyone who might be trying = to restore a set from several cadavers, the Audio Pack Assemblies for the EMOPS and HKLR (BC-348 and equivalent BC-224) differ only on in component= number (on the schematic) and wire color codes. But the JNQ unit has no capacitor and the dynamotor filter choke doesn't go to ground (it was in the B+ rather than B- lead). =

73
Robert Downs
<WA5CAB@cs.com>
Houston

From: WA1KBQ@aol.com
Message-ID: <16.24f7473a.2aabff18@aol.com>
Date: Sat, 7 Sep 2002 21:17:12 EDT
Subject: Re: GC Decorative Nut Wrench
To: Old Tube Radios <boatanchors@theporch.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Without metal working equipment to fix the GC nut wrench you can still use a pair of slip joint pliers held sideways with strips of masking tape on the front panel all around the nut to protect the finish. Engage the inner curved set of teeth over the OD of the nut and with a steady hand and a steady grip loosen the nut. Plier teeth that fit the nut splines pretty good will work better than you would think. GC tools that have not been modified should not be used if you want to save the nut. It is a sure thing they will slip. Before I got the GC wrenches I bought several different styles and sizes and various makes of common slip joint pliers to get a good selection of teeth shapes to choose from to fit the different nuts I was encountering in the

course of all my radio projects around here. Of course if you can get access to behind the front there will be a hex nut there but you might need a thin wrench to fit in the small space between the chassis and the front panel. With this arrangement you position the decorative nut where you want it and tighten the hex nut from behind. For those with metal working equipment again for your toolbox you will need to grind and polish 1/2" and 9/16" end wrenches about half way up the shank of the wrench to get them thin enough to fit in this area. National receivers will not allow access to behind the front panel due to their cabinet construction so please be careful with those decorative nuts. They are soft nickel plated brass and the splines are very shallow. I have never seen replacement nuts for a National receiver except on another National receiver.

Greg Gore
Charlotte, NC

End of BOATANCHORS Digest 3389
